COMMUNITY *IN* SCHOOL:

CENTRAL TO CHARACTER FORMATION

AND MORE

White House Conference
On
Character and Community
June 19, 2002

Presented By

Eric Schaps, Ph.D.

Developmental Studies Center

Oakland, CA

In my Center's work with schools, we often survey students and ask them how much they agree

or disagree with such statements as:

- Students at this school really care about each other.

- In my class students have a say in deciding what goes on.

- I feel that I can talk to the teachers in this school about things that are bothering me.

These statements reflect the central focus of our Child Development Project (CDP)—helping

elementary schools to create a strong "sense of community" in the classroom and the school at

large, a community that links students, their parents or other caregivers, and the school's staff in

supporting the growth and learning of every student. Through this focus on building community *in* school, CDP helps schools to foster students' ethical, social, and emotional growth, as well as their academic learning

To build community, the CDP program assists a school in modifying its curriculum, pedagogy, organization, and climate *so that the daily experience of school itself becomes the character education program, the social and emotional learning program, and the problem prevention program, as well as the academic program.* CDP's community-building components include:

- *Class meetings* – Used to set goals and norms, plan activities, make decisions, identify and solve problems, and promote reflection, through teacher-facilitated, whole-class participation.

- *Cooperative learning activities* – Students collaborate in pairs and small groups for academic learning and other purposes.

- *Buddies program* – Whole classes of older and younger students pair up. Each older student is paired with a younger "buddy" for the semester or year, to engage in various academic and recreational activities.

- *School-wide activities* – Innovative school events that link students, parents, and teachers in creating an inclusive, supportive school culture.

- *Parent involvement activities* – Structured home conversations, mostly interviews conducted by the student with a parent or other caregiver, that link school learning to family experiences and perspectives.

Taken together, these components are intended to strengthen relationships within the classroom, within the school at large, and between home and school.

When a school becomes a stronger, more caring community, it more effectively meets basic student needs—their needs for physical and psychological safety; for a sense of belonging and connection to others; for a sense that one is a competent, worthy person; and for a sense of autonomy (sometimes referred to as "voice and choice"). Leading theoreticians and researchers (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci, et al., 1985; Maslow, 1954) contend that these needs for autonomy, belonging, competence, and safety are basic to human motivation, to what drives and shapes our thinking, feelings, and behavior.

Finally, when a school helps its students to satisfy their basic needs, *because* it is helping them to do so, it prompts them to "bond"—to become affectively committed—to its goals and values, just as a mother who effectively cares for an infant causes that baby to bond to her and to strive to emulate her (Watson et al., 1989). And just as maternal bonding fosters a baby's healthy development, as we will see below, schools that effectively promote bonding foster healthy learning and growth—of many kinds—and help students to avoid problems ranging from emotional distress to drug use to violence.

Measuring Community in School

My Center uses three questionnaire scales to measure sense of community. Beginning at third or fourth grade, we survey students about:

- *Classroom supportiveness* –by asking them to agree or disagree with such statements as: "My class is like a family" and "Students in my class help each other learn."

- *Classroom autonomy* –by asking them about opportunities to exercise autonomy, such as how often "Students in my class students can get a rule changed if they think it is unfair" and "In my class I get to do things that I want to do."

- *School supportiveness* –by asking them to agree or disagree with such statements as: "Teachers and students treat each other with respect at this school" and "Students in this school help each other, even if they are not friends."

Unfortunately, our research suggests that sense of community is not strong in many if not most schools, and that it tends to be significantly lower for low-income students and students of color than for their Anglo, more-affluent peers (Battistich et al., 1995). Thus, students who are often most in need of a supportive school environment (Tharp, 1989) may be further disadvantaged by the quality of their experience in school.

Evidence of CDP's Effectiveness

The CDP program has been rigorously evaluated in three quasi-experimental studies over the last 20 years. The largest and most recent was a comparative evaluation involving 12 program and 12 matched comparison schools in six school districts across the U.S. In this four-year study, a culturally, ethnically, and socio-economically diverse sample of approximately 14,000 students was assessed at baseline and during each of three years of implementation. In addition, students from half of these program and comparison elementary schools were followed up as they progressed through middle school.

These studies consistently have shown that when widely implemented in a school, CDP significantly increases students' sense of the school as a community and yields a wide range of

other positive outcomes without any negative effects. The favorable outcomes include significantly more positive attitudes toward school and learning, more positive attitudes toward the self, more positive social and ethical attitudes and behaviors, and reduced involvement in problem behaviors. Moreover, consistent with program theory, analyses indicate that virtually all of these positive outcomes are mediated by increases in sense of community.

Follow-up findings indicate that former program students maintain their greater tendency to bond to school during their middle school years, yielding continuing widespread, significant effects. During middle school, former program students were found to have more positive attitudes toward school and learning than comparison students, and to have higher course grades and achievement test scores. They were more involved in positive youth activities, and were rated by their teachers as being more engaged in learning, showing more leadership qualities, being more concerned about others, and being less alienated than comparison students. Former program students also were less involved in problem behaviors during middle school, including engaging in less misconduct at school and less serious delinquency than comparison students. Finally, program students had more friends who were also positively involved in school, and fewer friends who were involved in school misconduct and delinquency. There again were no significant effects favoring comparison students.

Because of CDP's demonstrated effects, the U.S. Center for Substance Abuse Prevention has selected it as a model drug prevention program, and the U.S. Department of Education has recognized it as a promising violence prevention program as well as an "Obey-Porter" (Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration) model. Schools and districts that are interested in learning more about CDP can visit our web site at www.devstu.org.

Conclusion

In summary, the evidence is now clear that strengthening sense of community promotes school bonding, and is central to students' healthy development—ethically, socially, emotionally, and academically. Many of the positive effects of heightening community in elementary school persist through the middle school years. It is also clear that sense of community can be strengthened in feasible and affordable ways.

Finally, the importance of community, "connectedness," or "belonging" in school is also being demonstrated by other researchers, including Resnick et al. (1997), Bryk & Driscoll (1988), and Hawkins et al. (1999). We hope that this growing body of research evidence will prompt wider recognition that a focus on building community in school is central to improving education in this nation and to creating a healthy, humane, and productive society.

References

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., Solomon, D., & Lewis, C. (2000). Effects of the Child Development Project on students' drug use and other problem behaviors. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 21*, 75-99.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1995). Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and performance: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, **32**, 627-658.

Baumeister, R. F., and Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, **117**(3), 497-529.

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). *The school as community: Theoretical foundations, contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers.* Madison, WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Kosterman, R., Abbott, R., & Hill, K. G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behaviors by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 153*, 226-234.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper and Row.

Resnick, M. et. al. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm, Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *278*, 823-832.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V. & Solomon, D. (1997). School as a caring community: A key to character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The Construction of Children's Character, Part II, 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Watson, M., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (2000). A six-district study of educational change: Direct and mediated effects of the Child Development Project. *Social Psychology of Education, 4,* 3-51.

Tharp, R. G. (1989). Psychocultural variables and constants: Effects on teaching and learning in schools. *American Psychologist, 44*, 349-359.

Watson, M., Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Solomon, J. (1989). The Child Development Project: Combining traditional and developmental approaches to values

education. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue*.

Berkeley: McCutchan, pp. 51-92.